MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
16 November 1966

INDEX

		Page
INTERVIEWS		
1.	Department of the Army	
	a. Arlington National Cemetery	1-2
	b. Fort Myer, B.O.Q.	2
2.	Department of Buildings and Grounds, D.C. Govt.	2
	Weatherless School, 11th Chaplin Park, N.E.	
3.	General Services Administration, Public Bldgs. Svc.	
	a. F.B.I. Building	3
	b. Department of Labor Building	3
	c. U.S. Tax Court	3-4
4.	Pennsylvania Avenue Building Commission	
	a. National Square - Proposed Design	4
	b. Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Landscaping	4-5
5.	Department of the Interior, National Park Service	
	a. Reflecting Pool	5
	b. Mall Redevelopment Plan	5
	c. Landscaping of the Ellipse	5-6
	d. Reflecting Pool, East End of Mall	6

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its offices in the Interior Department Building on 16 November 1966, at 9:30 a.m., with Chairman William Walton presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Pat Astore

Recorder: Tom Stout

The Commission approved the minutes of the September meeting.

II. INTERVIEWS

1. Department of the Army

Mr. Weber and other representatives of the Department of the Army, and Mr. Lethbridge, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. Arlington National Cemetery

Mr. Sasaki withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this project.

Mr. Lethbridge described, in detail, the project which combined architecture and landscape architecture. The landscape plan involved separating general tourists from those attending funerals or visiting family graves. Tourist cars and buses would be parked in a garage under Memorial Drive. Garage ramps were at the cemetery entrance. Pedestrian ways and mini-buses would lead tourists to points of public interest. Tourist autos and buses would be kept out of the cemetery proper. A new axis linking the Tomb of the Unknowns, a pond, the field of heroes and the new chapel would be a prime feature of the development in what was formerly Ft. Myer's South Post.

The chapel and service complex would be constructed first. A temporary parking lot and temporary visitor's center were planned until

completion of the underground garage and permanent visitors' center.

The Commission considered the landscape plan an appropriate and skillful approach to this large project, but stressed their feeling that any surface tourist parking was only an undesirable temporary expedient.

b. Fort Myer, B.O.Q. - Proposed Design

Mr. Lethbridge discussed the master plan of Fort Myer. He proposed removal of the motor pool and the construction of a new parking structure to provide a more suitable site for the B.O.Q. and an athletic area. With the completion of this facility the 500 car parking lot was unnecessary.

Describing the B.O.Q. which would have approximately 500 units, Mr. Lethbridge explained the crescent shaped structure with its perpendicular rear wing. A parking structure with two levels, the upper one open, was parallel and behind the main building. The cost was much less than a totally underground structure. Exterior material would be concrete, and a brick selected to harmonize with brick of the existing buildings. The Commission congratulated the architect on the planning and design for the B.O.Q.

The Commission's approval of the above projects (2) was forwarded to the Department of the Army. EXHIBITS A & B

2. Department of Buildings and Grounds, D.C. Government

Weatherless School, Ft. Chaplin Park, N.E., - Proposed Design. Mr. Warren Sargent, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project. Mr. Sargent explained that the wooded park area adjoining the site would be developed as a natural park and not as a playground area for the school.

Mr. Warnecke stated that the architect had not made good use of the land and that the relationship between the school, the street, the parking and the playground was weak. The kindergarten and small childrens play area should not be adjacent to the main classrooms. Mr. Kelly commented on the poor sites given to schools in this city.

The Commission disapproved the site plan, the building plan, and design for this school. Better use of the land by resiting the building and simplification of the massing were recommended.

The Department of Buildings and Grounds was informed of the Commission's action. EXHIBIT C

3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Messrs. Karel Yasko, J. Rowland Snyder, and other representatives of Public Buildings Service attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. F.B.I. Building - Proposed Design

Mr. Manny and Mr. Gladych, representing the architects, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project. Mr. Gladych explained in detail the plan of the building based on the organization and function of the F.B.I. He commented on the huge spaces for mechanical equipment required for this large structure, and the necessity for having a penthouse. Designed as a steel structure, the building would have a pre-cast concrete facade.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Bunshaft expressed the members' approval of the massing of the various elements of the design. He stated that the vertical stripe effect of the facade was unsatisfactory with respect to scale and expression and required further study. He also mentioned the Commission's disapproval of the center court with its complicated sculptural forms and protrusions. Restudy of the exterior skin and the central court was requested.

b. Department of Labor Building - Proposed Design

Messrs. Pitts, Palmer and Halprin, representing the architects, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project. Speaking for the architects, Mr. Pitts explained the steel frame structure of the building which would have a 30x30 span. Limestone, precast concrete and marble were being studied for the facade. Efforts will be made to express sunlight and shadow patterns.

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the Commission's general approval of the massing of the building and commented on the good proportions of the design. He acknowledged the architects' difficult problem of designing a monumental building for this site, with some expression that has character and commitment. He recommended that the architects thoroughly study the exterior surface and resubmit the design.

c. U.S. Tax Court - Proposed Design

Messrs. Lundy and Lyles, representing the architects, Judge Scott, Mr. Shonnenfelder and others of the U.S.Tax Court attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Lundy commented on the exterior surface which would have a facing of two inch nominal thickness of dark, royal pearl granite and three-eighths inch bronze colored glass. In response to the Commission's

question concerning a safety feature for the ceremonial type entrance stairs, he stated that they were studying this and were considering a low eighteen inch section at the stair ends.

Judge Scott expressed the members of the Court appreciation to Mr. Lundy for a well designed building.

Mr. Bunshaft stated the Commission's approval and admiration of the design. Chairman Walton congratulated the architect on achieving the Commission's aim, an excellently designed building.

The Public Buildings Service was informed of the Commission's general approval, and recommendations for projects a and b above, and approval of project c. EXHIBITS D,E,F

4. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Mr. Woodbridge, representing the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. National Square - Proposed Design

Mr. Woodbridge stated that the fountains would be covered during parades and the procession would continue through the Square. The west side of the Square was conceived as a ceremonial and visitors' entrance to the White House.

The Commission felt that the design of the west side of the Square was too complicated and did not clearly define the terminus of Pennsylvania Avenue. Further study of this section was required, but details of the rest of the Square could be developed from the plans presented.

b. Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Landscaping

Mr. Kiley, landscape architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project. He defended the plan for closely spaced, architecturally trimmed trees on the north side of the Avenue by stating that the mass of trees was one element of the Plan that could gain some strength immediately as an entity. The area from the buildings to the curb (70 feet) would give a variety of human spaces and required coverage. The density of the trees would perform an architectural purpose in strengthening the entire Avenue.

Mr. Sasaki stated the Commission's request that the existing design for the south side be repeated on the north. Here a single row of large, untrimmed trees, spaced approximately 50 feet apart did not compete with the architecture nor create a tremendous barrier but enhanced the buildings and provided shade for pedestrians. Mr. Bunshaft commented that the trees should be natural in shape to contrast with the rectilinear

architecture. The plan seemed out of scale and required coordination between the architects and landscape architects.

The Commission discussed the possibilities of using granite in place of the heavy duty red brick proposed for paving Pennsylvania Avenue, but had their doubts relieved and decided in favor of the brick presented by the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

The Pennsylvania Avenue Commission was informed of the Commission's approval of the design for the National Square, providing the west side is restudied, and disapproval of the landscape plan for the Avenue.

EXHIBITS G,H

5. Department of Interior, National Park Service

Mr. George Hartzog, Director, National Park Service and other representatives of the Park Service, Mr. Kirkpatrick of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, architectural firm, and Mr. Kiley, landscape architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. Reflecting Pool, East End of Mall (discussed later with Mr. Kirkpatrick).

b. Mall Redevelopment Plan

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall also attended the meeting during the discussion of this project. Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the meeting.

Chairman Walton lead the discussion by stating that the Commission was not convinced that cars could be totally banned from the Mall without turning the area into a park preserve which is not the true purpose of the Mall. Major traffic arteries should not cross the area, but some streets with minor traffic flow should be permitted. The Beaux Art plan for an overlook at the east boundary of the Washington Monument interrupted the main feature of the Mall which is the continuous grass panel. The width of this panel should be the same throughout and not narrowed by additional rows of trees on the eastern section. The whole design was being tightened too much and was probably being heavily over-planted.

Secretary Udall's remarks and the reasoning of the Park Service, architect and landscape architect which governed the plan and the comments of members of the Commission are contained in the transcripts of the meeting which are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT I

c. Landscaping of the Ellipse

Mr. Hartzog stated that the concept of the plan was to

develop a place for ceremonial functions for foreign diplomats. A heli-pad and small gun emplacements were contemplated as well as an underground garage for security cars. The existing walk would be retained and used as a ceremonial drive when necessary. A bicycle path was proposed beyond the walk. He suggested that the staffs of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts and of the National Park Service work together to develop a generally acceptable plan.

Mr. Sasaki remarked that the small details of the plan bore little or no relationship to the total form. They appeared as isolated parts and out of scale with the magnitude of the entire large design of the Ellipse. Traffic should be lessened in this area and benches added for people waiting to visit the White House. Mr.Kelly stated the Commission's view stressing the need to restore the area rather than redesign it.

d. Reflecting Pool, East End of the Mall

The Commission found the reflecting pool scheme submitted overly complicated and recommended elimination of the swag and stairs in front of the Grant statue. The members preferred the simplicity of the earlier plan as shown on the model. They were glad that the previously planned skating rink in the central section of the reflecting pool had been eliminated.

The National Park Service was informed of the Commission's actions on the above projects (2). EXHIBIT J

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

29 November 1966

Dear Colonel Proctor:

At its meeting on November 16th the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the design for the extension of Arlington Cemetery on the South Post of Ft. Myer.

There is every indication that the architects have developed an exceptionally good solution. One of the most difficult problems to cope with has been the mounting traffic and the ever increasing pressures for parking. Circulation and parking facilities envisioned in this plan should in every way resolve this in a satisfactory way. A new lake and open field on the axis of the Tomb of the Unknowns would also help to tie this new area to the old which has been a need sorely lacking in previous studies. The planting should be handled in a manner that makes this relationship apparent. The new chapel appears to be very well located in this respect.

The Commission would like to sound one note of caution. The stairways leading from the underground parking adjoining Memorial Avenue appear somewhat out of place alongside the sites occupied by various statues. The picture of people emerging from underground in these locations may cause some unfortunate associations. This also applies to the stairways emerging at the end of the Avenue within the formal semi-circular area and gateway to the cemetery. Both of these features should certainly be given some additional thought.

Otherwise the remaining elements of the plan, especially the carefully studied grading and planting appear to be excellent in every respect. In approving the plans, we would like to emphasize that the commission is accepting the interim parking lot only as a temporary measure and not "temporary" in the usual sense of Washington usage. It cannot remain ever any extensive period. Every effort must be made to complete the permanent facility at the earliest possible time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Colonel F. B. Proctor
District Engineer
Norfolk District Corps of Engineers
Ft. Norfolk, 803 Front Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

Exhibit A

29 November 1966

Dear Colonel Proctor:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the new Bachelors Officers Quarters at Fort Myer at their meeting on November 16th.

The Commission feels the design is generally successful. It is well sited on the hillside, concentrating most of the mass away from the older residences. Parking facilities are also nicely handled and we would hope that such a scheme would set a precedent. There was some question about the larger mass to the rear of the crescent, but after talking to the architects there appears to be no real objection. The landscaping in this area is fairly dense and we doubt whether this wing will be particularly noticeable.

The selection of brick, of course, is important. We therefore would like to see a sample panel constructed on the site prior to final selection.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Colonel F.B. Proctor
District Engineer
Norfolk District Corps of Engineers
Ft. Norfolk, 803 Front Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

Exhibit B

29 November 1966

Dear General Duke:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the new elementary school at Fort Chaplain Park, S.E. at its meeting on 16 November.

We found the scheme entirely too complicated. The program is fairly simple as are most of the school programs. And we see no reason why the architecture cannot reflect this. We recognize there are certain drawbacks to the site, in particular the extensive easement on the front of the property. But this should be one more reason that compells a simple architectural solution. We therefore asked the designers to restudy the whole problem.

Our next meeting is scheduled for January 17 and we will be glad to review any new material at that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General C. M. Duke
Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit C

29 November 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts studied the latest developments of the F.B.I. building on Pennsylvania Avenue at its meeting on November 16th.

The design has now reached a critical point. As you know, the Commission has generally approved the progress to date. The massing and proportions are settled. Now the problem is to achieve an appropriate scale and character that will evolve from details of the facades. And the Commission does not believe the design is proceding well.

The building lacks scale and the massive elevations look monotonous and in some ways awkward. We would like to see a number of studies showing alternate schemes for handling the skin of this structure. There are many ways of doing it and we are not suggesting any one approach. What we are saying is that the present approach is not satisfactory. The F.B.I. headquarters building occupies a pivotal point in the Pennsylvania Avenue redevelopment and it is obvious that the architecture has to excell.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for January 17th, which should give the architects plenty of time to make the required study.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D

29 November 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the new Labor Department Building at its meeting on November 16th and approved the design at this stage of development.

What remains now is a solution of the facades that will be interesting and in keeping with the character of the surrounding monumental area. This is not an easy task. In many ways the problem is identical to that of the F.B.I. headquarters. The viewer is confronted with a building of enormous size and there must be elements that will give a scale and interest that makes sense architecturally. Basically the facades are a veneer over a structural frame and the expression should be consistent. This is not to say that the surfaces should be completely flat and unrelieved. But there should be a clear indication of just how the exterior materials are being used.

A number of materials are being considered by the architects, among them limestone, which probably is about the best masonry that can be used here. Marble, we think, is unsuitable for such a large building and there is no guarantee that precast concrete stands up especially well, despite all the technical advances.

As a way of studying this problem quickly we suggest the architects make a number of rough sketches exploring a variety of schemes and present them to us at our next meeting on January 17th. Hopefully we can establish an appropriate direction at that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit E

29 November 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

The designs for the U.S. Tax Court Building met a warm approval at our meeting on November 16th.

As you know, the Commission had approved Mr. Lundy's revised scheme some time ago and the new drawings show an evolution in detail that is entirely in keeping with the original concept. All of the material presented indicated the most careful kind of study on the part of the architect which is reassuring in a project of this importance. We have no doubt that the design will continue to evolve in this manner and that the eventual building will be one of which the Federal Government can be proud.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit F

29 November 1966

Dear Mr. Owings:

The Commission of Fine Arts viewed the model and detailed drawings of the National Square at its meeting on November 16th.

The boundaries, of course, have been approved by the Commission and are well set. The belvedere on the north, the planting on the south, and the general paving scheme and fountain present no problem. The whole development of the west side of the Square, however, has not been resolved. In this Commission's view, the rather elaborate entrance scheme for visitors to the White House is too complicated and does not afford a good setting for the Treasury Department, which I think you will agree is one of the finer buildings in Washington.

We do not have any solution to this problem in mind -- we would just like to emphasize that the present proposal is not the answer. Perhaps leaving the Sherman statue and present planting is.

The Commission does not see why this problem should cause the rest of the National Square development to falter. In fact, the entire Square east of 15th Street could go ahead now as planned.

Of course we expect to see the actual design in greater detail in the normal course of development. This is especially true of the fountain which is going to have to be handled in a way that can accommodate the parade route for inauguration celebrations, etc.

We would be glad to look at any new studies of the Square as they are completed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

Mr. Nathanial A. Owings
Chairman
President's Temporary Commission on
Pennsylvania Avenue
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C

29 November 1966

Dear Mr. Owings:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered in detail the landscape and paving scheme for Pennsylvania Avenue at its meeting on November 16th.

We are very much concerned about the density of the proposed planting. Buildings along Pennsylvania Avenue define the space and should be seen, yet the coverage of these closely planted trees shown on the plans is going to completely shut off the view. The section through the viewing platform incorporated into the buildings on the north side also confirms this as the foliage is right in line with the eye level of the pedestrian.

The landscape along the Avenue should offer a contrast and a foil to the architecture and not compete with it. The severely clipped trees are an architectural element and would not serve this purpose. Larger trees in natural and free form should be spaced further apart and of sufficient height to see the buildings along the Avenue. The present planting on the south side is, in our opinion, highly successful and this character should be repeated on the north side. The width of the sidewalk on the north is considerable, but interest can be achieved in a number of ways by the use of paving textures, lighting, etc.

In this regard there was also some question about the red brick on the Avenue itself. There was some feeling that it might be a bit too residential in character and would stain poorly. Has any consideration been given to granite paving blocks? These, of course, are a traditional material in monumental settings and wear very well.

We would like to see further study on this matter. The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for January 17th and we will be glad to look at any new designs at that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Nathanial A. Owings
Chairman
President's Temporary Commission on
Pennsylvania Avenue
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit H

room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We made some notes on our general feeling about this, and the various members of the Commission will want to comment. But, what came out of our discussion is we started on details and then got into bigger issues, finally, so let's reverse it and we are not yet convinced that the automobile can be totally banned from this great area without turning it into a park preserve which is, finally, not its true purpose.

We think that even though all considitions were ideal, and that you could ban the automobile, that it would be necessarily right. There are many times when the residents of this city get a great enjoyment out of seeing this, even though they are not stopping. But, that doesn't mean that we are in favor of great lines of traffic going through this area all the time. But, we think that there is probably some slight compromise that is possible, for instance, of keeping open two cross streets on the surface; there would be a motor drive through this area, and even through Haines Point, that was not a traffic artery and you'd get off the line of traffic.

We are not allowing commuters to go through here, or intra-state, or anything else but there would be a surface way that a nice elderly couple from southeast Washington who

wishes to take an evening drive can drive through here, and around Haines Point as they do now, and on out that we shouldn't prevent the possibility of this.

SECRETARY UDALL: I don't think that I quarrel with that thought, Bill, but because this has been very basic you immediately get down to the question of what you are going to do where and, of course, we have had in mind all along that--and I would certainly hope you wouldn't argue--for keeping this main artery in here because, of course, part of the tunnel plan--this tunnel would go underneath here and would come right across through here, and the whole idea would be the elimination of this thundering herd that comes down across here.

But, we had envisioned for example keeping this Ohio Drive in. We have this new Cherry Tree Drive that Mrs. Lasker endowed on down Haines Point, and that this is the very idea that you are talking about that there should be some highways remain, and my own feelings about it would be to object to having some crossings where there would be vistas. I wonder, to get more specific though, what the view would be with regard to the present highways that are in this area from here to there.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is right, then we have got into our feelings about specific items in this. We are worried

about this area here. We think it has a slight Beaux Art look. We think that it somewhat interrupts one of the greatest features of the Mall which is the continuous grass panel, and we are worried about the width of the panel. We will get to that in a minute, but we have a feeling that these facilities that are proposed here perhaps should be pushed back on either side; that more should be maintained of the open green look through there, and we would think that possibly this would be one of the streets that was kept open.

MR. KELLY: When we say kept open, I think we should emphasize that we want to dip it a little bit.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are not talking about maintaini it in its present form.

MR. KELLY: When you go across Central Park, you know, you are down but you do get a sense as you go through of the park and this is one of the few places where you could see this magnificent vista just by driving across it.

MR. SASAKI: We wanted these depressions and perhaps this one.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This was the other one we thought was a possible surface street, not maintaining it as it is. This is 4th Street. This is already in process; isn't it? And this exists and that exists.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: 9th Street is now under

construction. 7th Street is on the surface. 12 Street is constructed. This has been planned as an underpass, and 4th Street there planned as an underpass and a ceremonial drive at the end is replacing 1st, 2nd, and 3rd.

MR. KELLY: My preference would be for 7th and 14th.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: None of these are pretended to be final. We are just sort of trying to give you our general views.

SECRETARY UDALL: Let me put one thing in here, too. We haven't asked ourselves the question--at least I have never discussed it with George and the Park Service people--just where this proposed public electric minibus system would run and operate.

Now, it may be that if we locate it properly it answers part of your question but at least the way some of us have been thinking about it--and we have the new visitor's center legislation--would be that you are going to have to, number one, tie into the visitor's center somewhere, and you are also going to have to tie into the downtown area somewhere, so that the thing comes out, but ultimately it would have at least one terminal point--or not terminal point--but stopping point here at the Capitol and then move down the Mall I have always thought, George, down the Mall.

MR. HERTZOG: Right through here.

SECRETARY UDALL: You don't need to make highways of this. These are small electric vehicles, and with the stops at all the points along the way, and it would probably circle out around here, and then in through this area here to the Lincoln Memorial and out to the Arlington Cemetery, to the Lee Mansion, Kennedy Grave, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and then back around here picking up the Jefferson Memorial, the Aquarium, and possibly coming back in you see. So, that you just have a big loop and they combine.

MR. WARNECKE: What if you don't want to take that route?

MR. KELLY: The people we are concerned with, Mr. Secretary, are the people who do not specifically come here for the purpose of spending a day and a half and at present there are several spots along there where just in passing through you can get a sense of one of the most beautiful vistas in the whole United States.

SECRETARY UDALL: We have got to get down to cases and be more specific, and to sort of firm this up, George, because we may want to implement this next spring after the success we have had. The taxi drivers are mad at us, but we have been successful so in terms of what we propose either let us suggest changes in that, or identify what the missing

elements are so that we would then know how to address ourselve to the problem of these other forms of transportation.

MR. KELLY: If you put yourself in the frame of mind of what it would be like to live in Washington just ordinarily without being able to go across here, without being able to go across here, without being able to go across there or any other places, you see what a massive change you are making in the ability of just ordinary people to get some sense of this great area.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Then, our other deep feeling is that the access is being constricted too much for the scale of the things that are involved; that the whole thing is being tightened too much, and that it is probably being over-planted heavily.

MR. SASAKI: These trees may be little under-sized trees on the model, so it would be constricted even more. The width over there is very nice, and I think the MacMillan Commission studied this very carefully in proportion to the size, so this may be too narrow here.

MR. KILEY: The way it is now from this side in here, looking at the continuous length from the air like this it looks small. But, when you get down there we pictured this and studied it as a wide angle look, and it is just wide enough that there is not even a feeling of length there, and

one reason was to strengthen that plus making the blocks more distinct to give a little more sense of length and continuity.

I think now, in perspective, it closes down to almost a square and I think you have to go and stand in the middle of the Mall to feel that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have constantly done this, and we are looking at--

MR. WARNECKE: This space here we find quite beautiful. We find this space twice as long, and yet you have narrowed it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It loses its great generosity by tightening that center corridor.

MR. KILEY: I, personally, feel that weakens it when you let it stay out and that we studied this also very carefully and compared it to lots of other places on real models.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: When we get to this pool, we like this version of it better than we do this, this little sort of fake boat landing thing, whereas that is sort of nice.

MR. WARNECKE: This density you brought up yesterday, one of the most beautiful things driving in here is to look under the trees, and see this. Now, the way the density is all you might see is here, that is about your only

chance. It indicates such a denseness through here in the corners.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, our point really is the mound. That is a part of this monument, the base of the monument, and it must never be obscured. You must be able to see the mound on which the obelisk stands, or you will again obscure half of the thing. It isn't ugly, it isn't anything we have to hide. It is absolutely beautiful.

MR. KELLY: At the same time, it is very large in scale so there is a real advantage in being able to see it as you drive along.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It requires distance, you just can't come up on it.

MR. KILEY: You don't have to see everything in one way, and it should be changed, and the thing we are doing here is trying to strengthen the edges which I feel now are very thin. There is a tremendous space here, and we are not hurting the mound at all. We are giving it more of a genteel space where you can move around, where you can see through the trees, and in and out rather than just a sidewalk with a single line of trees. The White House and Elipse becomes much more a part of this, and I feel that the strengthening of the edge there, I think, this is all sort of relative and you might say in detail.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We wanted to state what some of the principles are, that we are interested in preserving this.

MR. WARNECKE: The model says certain things to us very clearly.

MR. KILEY: The model is still, you might say, the best that you can do at this scale. But, when you get down into space it is another sensation of scale and space, and reality.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: For instance, the elipse in actuality is far more beautiful than the model because the trees are graceful looping trees, and they are fortunately not these little tight model trees.

SECRETARY UDALL: Bill, the question you are raising with the Washington Monument and the mound itself, I think, is an important one in that this really raises the large question of vistas, and one thing that would interest you--and hopefully you will be wrestling with this one soon--is the Roosevelt Memorial that Marcel Breuer (Breuer) is working on, and we went out with him a few weeks ago to look at the site and the site that he is considering for the memorial is right here.

Now, under the earlier design that was considered one of the criteria that the Park Service, itself, laid down--or that was considered by someone else--was that the memorial

would not have any kind of vista opening to the Washington Monument, and when one looks at the Jefferson Memorial of course this is deliberately on an axis with the White House itself with that magnificent view all the way through.

But, it just seemed to us in going out and actually looking at the site that if the designer desired to have that option that he ought to be free, and we might have to move two or three of the trees, cherry trees. We wouldn't chop them down, we'd move them, because it just seemed to me that this would add an element that might be the whole making of it in terms of vistas.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You already have the four cardinal points taken up including the center here, and it shouldn't be too large--to prominent.

SECRETARY UDALL: That was our thought that it should be small, but having that view of the water and of the Washington Monument.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Small at least in height.

SECRETARY UDALL: That this might be quite vital.

MR. WOODBRIDGE: The model, incidentally, does unfortunately exaggerate in here but we feel that our premise on this was that we were taking out that pair of inner rows, and replacing them with a smaller really broad sidewalk, and that on the inner edge of this sidewalk--which would be

within the paving line--as you see it out there now would be this inner row of trees which does, in fact, occur about half way between these two inner rows now.

We felt that if you were to take--simply take out the rows as they exist now, and put the sidewalk there--for one thing the sidewalk has no shade which we felt was very unfortunate and, too, you'd be in effect widening the grass panel so you change the proportions as they exist now, and you'd really need another row of trees inboard of the ones that exist now. That was our reasoning for doing it.

MR. KILEY: The other element is the Capitol has such dominence, and you can see it from really over, not just from this line, and it dominates this whole hill and you can see it up here and here, and then looking the other way the needle is such a narrow finger that if you get too wide an alley to it it becomes less good.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are proposing a terribly deep change in this, because after all we are masking all of these great buildings that are here. They will only be seen over the tree tops, and we have got to move with great care and caution because we felt this is a very deep change in the whole concept of the Mall.

MR. WARNECKE: This is tremendous. These blocks of trees are forests in size. They are tremendous, and I

think we were proposing possibly taking one or two of these out, and if you want to put a larger tree over here that would be a detail to study.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: None of this, of course, is final and we wanted you to have our thinking on the whole concept.

MR. WARNECKE: We also question whether these little things didn't really interrupt that beautiful sweep you have there in the water.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We think the jets, then, should be under the trees and that the water should be playing in there. But, you shouldn't have jets down on that big panel.

MR. KILEY: One thing we felt about the profile of the Mall was that, unfortunately, you couldn't make it a concave profile because of the street elevations and that, therefore, it goes up and down and gives you that foreshortenir effect, and the idea on these panels was with each panel to sink it a little so that you get more detail in that long vista, but still retain the long vista as one big tremendous sweep. I think that the more we can extend even that, and make it even a little different than the reflecting pool, is a change, and I think as far as these groves I think they will be beautiful because we have all strolled under them in other places of the world and know how nice that is as

contrasted to the open spaces, as these were considered to be places where you could sit down and also get soft drinks and so forth so that when people are in there they are at least able to rest and not be walking all the time.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One of our thoughts was that the apprpriate spot for George's skating rink probably is somewhere over in here where the old Munitions Building is, for many reasons. This is the closest residential area to the whole Mall concept. This is still lived in over here, and people will be able to walk here. There is access and we ought to keep that in mind. Maybe you don't have to drive and park for using the facilities, and also it will be a raw material area that we can do anything we want to with it. We are not limited by some existing building. It would be awfully nice to prevent a building there by having used the land so well that nobody could move in on us.

MR. HERTZOG: The trouble is I need a skating rink this winter.

MR. KILEY: You have got it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You have got the most beautiful temporary rink in the world.

MR. WARNECKE: Right now, you need a recreation area or skating rink and we are conscious that there is a lot of nice open spaces for games and you see constantly the

baseball going on. What you are now showing is a new concept with very little open space, except for this, this, and this and we are cutting this down to nothing and the city is growing and growing and we don't think we need a forest. I think it is an over tendency here to--

MR. KILEY: It's a thing of appropriateness. This is your front door, really, to the whole nation and that is not a place that you want to necessarily play games and there are so many big parks and open spaces in Washington that in certain places have these elements in them, but you have these places like the Capitol and the Washington Momument where I think it is a different kind of emphasis and which lends variety, and it all gives more of a romantic loose turning point in here.

You have got the big park with open playgrounds in it, which gives a different kind of gay quality, the more human idea around that park which in itself is one whole other diversified use, and so I think having the different things expressed well and strongly has something to do with appropriateness, in that just as you come into your house you do one thing in the hall and--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Is this a rose garden?

MR. KILEY: Yes.

SECRETARY UDALL: One of the things that strikes

me, because I partly agree with Jack on this point and I have already had enough backlash--to use a current term--on this from various people and I'd feel a little better about it in terms of the--I mean if we say, as we have said, that one of our main purposes is to bring people to the Mall; to have it lived in, enjoyed, and so on and if that is our main purpose we don't want to have too much of it that is built in a stylized and formalized way, and so I'd feel a lot better if we had a few of these spaces somewhere in here, for example, where--in other words, why does this have to be all like this?

MR. WARNECKE: It is just like a building the way it is designed.

SECRETARY UDALL: Why does this have to be built over?

MR. KILEY: The space there is naturally suited to the English park style, and I think one of the problems--you might say--of a loose open park versus some more formal element is that if you have the space in large enough scale that you can really do a beautiful English park, and then it is wonderful, but if you are just getting little edges and a sort of two dimensional effect then it becomes kind of silly.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is bigger than it looks on the model. When you get there, you have got a great deal of

space.

MR. KILEY: You have such elements as the visitors center, and restaurant, proposals and the rose garden and that type of thing that have certain form. These are just diagrams, of course, at this stage. They might change to softer forms, curves, or what have you.

SECRETARY UDALL: We are talking of games, and recreation, a baseball field. We have never had any feeling but positive toward recreation; a childrens' carrousel; bandstand, things of that scale under these trees but to put a ballfield down there would be totally inappropriate.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Why are you planning out that marvelous ballfield that you have got down there?

MR. WARNECKE: We have approved school after school for the last three years, and not one of these has sufficient recreation space in a highly urbanized area that is going to increase in density, and there isn't an over abundance of recreation space. We see a lot of games going on there, rugby games and so on.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: From the overall point of view of the city, those game areas are really best related to the communities where people can get at them instead of going a mile or two to reach a field. I mean, it is still possible to play here and also in here.

MR. HERTZOG: This is the reason, right now you can't maintain it. I have spent a fantastic amount of money in this city in the last two years trying to get one park up to class A standards. We have had every one of them audited, and I just got the report on my desk of all the money that we have poured in there for six little triangles that have reached the class A standard.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If the grass is restored by the people who favor it, I am in favor of restoring it.

MR. HERTZOG: Yes, but that is the most wasteful use of open space because you have got eighteen guys playing ball, and most of them are people who work in the buildings nearby or living there in Virginia and Maryland. I am not opposed to having a ballfield, but the youngsters that Jack is talking about and these people I am in sympathy with and we have got a planning team working right now to find some other places where people live in these communities where they can have open space.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's not ban them from this great space. That is the vitality that we are talking about.

MR. HERTZOG: That is what the East Potomac Park area down here is for, but you can't have this area it seems to me in the great heartland of a historic city and not have a class A maintenance program in it, and you can't have class A

maintenance and have baseball and all of these other things right in the middle of a historic area and maintain the grass, too. It won't work.

MR. KELLY: Well, you might have a few spots of class B maintenance.

MR. HERTZOG: I'm for that. I am all for that. One of the things that I came over here to say to Bill Kiley with regard to one of the suggestions that he made about taking the rose garden out of there, and that it be opened up for an open space, and depending on what the designers come up with for the Roosevelt Memorial here that perhaps the rose garden be put here in connection with the model, or this memorial, which will add an additional dimension of beauty to it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's a terribly easy element to relocate.

MR. KILEY: One of the reasons it was put there was because it was related to good parking being directly near to it, whereas over here if you create something that draws people with your easy drive then you are going to change the whole environment there, and the cars take up so much of the space and change the environment to a great extent.

MR. HERTZOG: We have to have some open space in the area for people to play in, but I heartily recommend

for your consideration the maintenance problem in trying to get this heartland up to a class A standard, and it has really been a rugged experience.

SECRETARY UDALL: One thing, just to make a final comment that strikes me here, this model is an attempt--the best that we can do at the present time--to depict some overall ideas and, of course, landscaping like a building ultimately you move from a visual concept to something quite specific and it seems to me as these particular pieces begin to fall in place we will know better how this will all look, and I am talking about the Mall not the buildings and we are planning ahead for the next ten or twelve years, and if we get this Roosevelt thing going then this piece will go in and so on down the line, and it is probable that the Commission will want to consider some of the pieces as we go along, and I think this is a wise approach because then you can actually decide how dense the trees are, and what vistas are left, and so on.

MR. KILEY: There is a program of requirements that can make changes in your approach and process. This is sort of a diagram.

MR. KELLY: The model serves its purpose beautifully because it does illustrate precisely the major points you wish raised, and that is what I think we are concerned with.

MR. WARNECKE: The points we are worried about,

the model says them.

MR. KILEY: If we made the model of the Mall much bigger and show these spaces under here better, I think it would change the look. I think one of my biggest problems in all the work we do is trying to show people that you can look under trees, for instance, and up.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One of the things that model says to us, all over again, is that it is such a pitty that this diagonal is not capable of re-emphasis in some way so we could bring it up. On the model, it looks nifty but in truth it is a forlorn area in a sense even though it--

MR. WARNECKE: One thing I think you said earlier with regard to the route of the minibuses, are you going to let cars also travel those routes, because otherwise projecting eight to ten, or fifteen years, where we now have some 10 million visitors we will have 25 million visitors! and all are going to have to take minibuses, and this is why we think you ought at the same time show some of these other roads where a visitor could spend five, ten, or twenty minutes at the most and get his vistas of Washington.

MR. KILEY: If everybody takes their car, you have a problem then. One out of every ten takes a car.

MR. WARNECKE: This is why it is a difficult job to design these things in such ways that you are not interferr

with most of the spaces. Just a few places here and there.

MR. HERTZOG: Actually, this model doesn't depict what is happening up there, because already we have agreed on a different approach for this tunnel so that whole road system you are seeing there is different, and I think your point will be taken care of with regard to the casual automobi driving through.

MR. WARNECKE: There should be provision for summertime, and other times of the year, when the residents could go through.

MR. HERTZOG; That would not be longitudinal traffic, that would be cross traffic.

MR. WARNECKE: When the great numbers come in the summer, you can close off these streets.

SECRETARY UDALL: Another thing that we need to give some thought to, also, as you look at all these differen trails here is perhaps the introduction of the bicycle, and getting people moving on their own locomotion and not confining everybodh to a minibus.

We have something here that we are just beginning to think through, and I think this is a very integral element and it is important that we, George, put it in fairly firm shape.

MR. HERTZOG: This is why we propose bicycle

trails right now, if we get clearance from you and the Planning Commission, to go on with some kind of design for an elipse in which we'd propose to furnish some of this right now, because this is a very serious need downtown.

MR. KELLY: This concept, as a whole, is very exciting. You are providing two elements that have never been in the concept. How do you take care of somebody who really wants to walk, and how do you take care of somebody who really wants to put in a half a day and look it over.

In this scheme, as you show it, you are tending to cut off the person who wants to look at it casually and who really wants to get a real lift.

MR. KILEY: These people come from all over the world, millions of them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If Versailles were embedded in the middle of Paris, it would be an apt illustration but it isn't. Versailles is suburban, and this is the heart of the Capitol of the country and it cannot be treated like Versailles.

MR. WARNECKE: Versailles is like going to the Harvard-Yale game on a Saturday afternoon with 20 to 30,000 people on buses.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We made some notes yesterday as we discussed it, and we thought we'd put out a little letter

of details.

SECRETARY UDALL: There is a natural drop-off in grade, and we thought it was made much more dramatic by coming up and chopping it off and this also made a transition between the English park, here, and the formal park here and these things shouldn't be as they are and shouldn't branch off into each other, and this is a way of saying that is the formal axis with the great vista and here's the English park.

MR. HERTZOG: I don't want any English and French park up here.

MR. KILEY: The whole thing is French anyway.

MR. HERTZOG: We are trying to Americanize it a little bit.

SECRETARY UDALL: I don't think you should put nationalities on it.

MR. KILEY: It's a natural terminating point where people come together, and whether you call it a Beaux Art Pla or not it is a natural overlook, and it seems stronger to terminate in this way, and it will then again give you another kind of experience to flow out around into there as well as have parking underneath and other facilities. The opposite would be just to have a road and a curb and so bleeding off in sort of a loose way into that park which I

think is, just from a classic point of view, isn't very strong. That is the whole idea of it.

MR. WARNECKE: They had a great base around this at one time, and we are saying the facilities here perhaps they can be located under the trees and on the other side, and build this in and make this simpler.

MR. KILEY: Since you need structure, why not use it as a terrace base. It is hidden and yet it is immediate, and you can be here and yet under cover.

MR. KELLY: We have conflicting assumptions. One is the flow of incidental traffic from the whole city goes by and gets a whole quick view of that thing and the other--

MR. HORN: We have another problem in this particula place, and it is not connected with your view. But, a few years ago--some ten years ago--we reached the maximum number of people who could reach the top of the Wasnington Monument. That was slightly over a million. We did a major overhaul of the facilities inside the Monument, and now we can get approximately two million but there is going to be more than that that want to do it, and in this facility there we were hoping that we could give some interpretation to people who are unable to get to the Monument, and in a location where they would have a good view of the Monument, you see.

MR. KELLY: Nobody doubts that the facility we were

thinking about would be over in here.

MR. HORN: That is one scheme, but there could be many schemes, and that is a large part of the purpose of this facility.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is one thing that I'd like to mention if I may on really how these studies came about. We, of course, had the traffic studies up to 1985 and at that time--and with the plan that was proposed--the land use for almost the whole area, at least over to here, would simply have been traffic.

Now, in order to bring up data to compare with this '85 fiture, we spent quite a bit of time researching the visitation and that sort of thing, and also the people who visited the Mall area such as in '85 and we figured there'd be about 158,000 people on a peak day visiting here, and that admittedly with all of the roads that were shown on here they'd basically be saturated at that time and that was why we made the big effort to separate out the things, becaus we felt if we provided incidental roads we'd have to put parking in and then we'd be lost.

It isn't a point to point basis that you can operat at that scale, we felt, so that although I think that it would go through an evolution and the plan would allow for this starting out slowly there would be this gradual evolutic

when it appeared that it wouldn't work, whereby roads would be cut off and so forth, and that they would be converte to minibuses. But, we don't have in mind at all that everyone would get on a minibus. It would be only if they wished to, and that is why the entrances along Constitution and Independe Avenues were studied so that they could get into these things of referral here without trying to do the whole thing in one day.

MR. KELLY: Your main point is good. The kind of thing we are talking about is like the thing that goes through Central Park. You don't get out, you don't wander around Central Park, but even though you are most of the way dug down fairly far in the ground because of the size of the buildings on both sides, you have a real sense of that space and it's an important feeling.

MR. KILEY: Central Park is an expedient. The road is going under there to protect the pedestrian, and it does very little for the motorist who is tearing through there. They are not getting relaxed tearing through Central Park.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There are still surface circulation roads.

MR. KELLY: I have been on a number of college campuses where they'd like to keep automobiles off, and yet

there are probably some places where the whole view of the whole architectural layout is justified with one drive.

SECRETARY UDALL: Once you agree that we have to do it in such a way that the traffic flow is going on uninterrupted, you don't want the people crossing the street.

MR. WARNECKE: We are assuming that you can handle 80% of the traffic under all this, and on the freeways, and so forth and we are assuming that there is 70% of the year when there is very little traffic down here, and those people who live here might like to travel through some of these quiet times.

MR. KILEY: Maybe the thing which gives a time control that you could even open that up for that type of thing

MR. WARNECKE: That is why I asked the question.

MR. KILEY: That could be a flexible arrangement. We only went to '85.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can't go too far out, because these figures may be all off 20%. Everybody realizes that, either in time or in volume.

MR. WARNECKE: If it sounds like we are making a lot of criticism, you have to realize you are talking about a vast city here so we are just picking on certain things.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The only thing is, you know, if we can explain some of our reasoning in trying to get it; in

other words, maybe we have asked for 100% and we are only going to get 75%.

MR. KELLY: You should get 100% of what you want, but you might lose some of the things that are there now.

MR. KILEY: In all of these detailed studies, the scale relationships and volume, and so forth, you can't really tell from this.

CHAIRMA WALTON: We could go on forever on this.

SECRETARY UDALL: I think it has been very useful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I hope we are going to keep your man for a little detailed thing.

(Whereupon, Secretary Udall left the room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What we want to consider now is the landscaping at the edge of the elipse, and we will get to your project now and I think we will ask you to lead off on this. There have been some strong ideas on this.

MR. SASAKI: We didn't quite understand this drawing. This is a walk, isn't it? This is a roadway.

MR. HORN: This is the existing concrete walk in white. This is at the location of the existing bituminous road.

MR. HERTZOG: We propose to change this into a bicycle trail through here, and leave this as a walk which then could also serve as a ceremonial drive for the ceremonies

29 November 1966

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

The Commission of Fine Arts was glad to see that plans for the Skating Pool on the east end of the Mall have been abandoned.

Details of the Reflecting Pool were discussed with representatives of the consulting architects following our meeting on November 16th. The Commission strongly recommends a restudy of the treatment in front of the Grant Statue. Now the design looks too much like a barge landing. We strongly prefer the earlier simpler version shown on the model.

We recognize there is an immediate need to resolve this issue since contract negotiations for the Center Leg Tunnel are well advanced. We indicated to the architects that we would be glad to circulate any new sketches of the pool so that we can get an early reaction from members of the Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director
National Park Service
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit 5

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
16 November 1966

AM
9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. INTERVIEWS

9:30 1. Department of the Army

a. Arlington Cemetery - Proposed Master Plan

b. Fort Myer B.O.Q. - Proposed Design

(representatives of architect and Department of the Army)

10:00 2. Department of Buildings and Grounds, D.C. Government

Weatherless School, Ft. Chaplain Park, S.E. -Proposed Design

(representatives of Dept. of Bldgs. & Grounds & architect)

10:15 3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. F.B.I. Building - Proposed Design

b. Labor Department Building - Proposed Design

c. U.S. Tax Court - Proposed Design

(representatives of Public Buildings Service and architects)

10:45 4. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

a. National Square - Proposed Design

b. Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Landscaping

(representatives of Pennsylvania Avenue Commission)

11:15 5. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

a. Reflecting Pool, East End of Mall

b. Mall Redevelopment Plan

c. Landscaping of the Ellipse

(representatives of National Park Service)